Facts for the People.—No. 1.

SPEECH OF REV. E. SMITH, in the Liberty Party Convention, of Ohio, at Mt. Vernon, June 9th, 1842, on the following resolution:

7th, *Resolved*, "That a long and melancholy experience hath shown, that liberty can make no safe compromise with despotism; that the just expectations of our fathers have been frustrated by the aggressions of slavery; that instead of its being confined to its ancient limits, and gradually perishing there, slavery has continually, and in open defiance of the Constitution, extended its borders and strengthened its dominions; has nullified and set at nought all the constitutional guaranties of our most sacred rights; has put a gag in the mouths of our Representatives; has denied in the slave States to the citizens of free States the privileges and immunities secured to them by the Constitution; has dishonored us in the eyes of all nations, by sustaining slavery and the slave trade at the very seat of the national government; has usurped the control of our national administration, negotiation, and legislation; has denied free labor its just reward, by confining its products chiefly to the restricted and non-paying markets of the slave States; and now openly stalks through the land, striking down whatever is most valuable in our institutions and laws."—*Furnished for publication by request of the Convention.*

[The substance of the following speech was also delivered to a mass meeting, in the Diamond market space, in the city of Pittsburgh, on Monday, the first of August, 1842, and requested to be published, by a vote of the meeting.]

Mr. President:—I am called by the Convention to speak to the 7th Resolution of the series reported by the business committee. I would be happy, Sir, could I do justice to the resolution, believing as I do, that the doctrines which it contains are susceptible of the clearest proof; but I feel myself cramped in two respects; first, for want of ability, and second, for want of time.

The ground assumed, that liberty can make no safe compromise with despotism, has been proven, truly, by "long and melancholy experience." The history of our world is a record of this. The story page of the historian exhibits, in letters of blood, that liberty can make no safe compromise with despotism or slavery of any kind: liberty and slavery are antagonistical principles, as much so as darkness and light. No harmony can ever exist between them: when brought into contact, they will war with each other, and this war can only cease, by the overthrow of one or the other. The history of our race, Mr. President, has made these positions *truisms;* and the agitations of our country, on the subject of slavery, are but the natural operation of the contest between liberty and slavery; and these will continue, until one or the other shall be overthrown. Slavery will die, or liberty must.

The resolution takes the ground, "that the just expectations of our fathers have been frustrated, by the oppression of the slave power." Of this, Sir, we have the most melancholy proof. What were their expectations? What their designs, when they formed the Federal Constitution? "To form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Have these expectations been met, these designs accomplished? The answer, No, comes up from all parts of our distracted, suffering, and almost ruined country.

We have heard much about the "blessed spirit, of compromise, which framed the constitution—formed this glorious Union," and the implied faith of the compact. But what were the interests compromised, and the implied faith, which our Southern brethren are continually ringing in our ears? The interests compromised were the interests of *liberty* and the interests of *slavery*, the interests of *free labor* and the *interests of slave labor*. These were the conflicting interests which contended for the mastery, and the compromise attempted to secure both, but failed, wholly failed, as we shall see presently. When the Constitution was adopted, slavery extended to all sections of the country; all the states were slave states, except one. Slavery then was not a sectional question. The interests of slave labor extended to all parts of the country, as did the interests of free labor. The only difference which then existed was this: the southern states had many slaves, the northern few. The one section had a greater interest in slavery than the other, while the north was more interested in free labor; but neither section had an exclusive interest in the *one*, or the *other*. And the means adopted to secure these conflicting interests, all sections of our common country had an interest in; but not an equal interest. This is the true state of the case, as it then existed.

We may now inquire into the means employed, or the measures adopted, to secure those conflicting interests. These we will find in the Constitution. The northern states were, for the most part, small, and the southern ones large. The first had but few slaves, the second, many. Those small states were given an equal representation in the Senate, the stable branch of the government. *See* Art. 1. Sec. 3. of the Constitution of the United States. According to this arrangement, the little State of Rhode Island had, and has, as much power in the Senate as the large State of Virginia, the mother of Presidents, whose territory

Facts for People.—No. 1.

SPEECH OF REV. H

n the Liberty Party Convention, o
non, June 9th, 1842, on the followi
7th, *Resolved*, "That a long and mel
ith shown, that liberty can make n
with despotism; that the just expecta
have been frustrated by the aggressi
nstead of its being confined to its ancie
ally perishing there, slavery has conti
defiance of the Constitution, extende
strengthened its dominions; has nu
thought all the constitutional guarantie
rights; has put a gag in the mouths
tives; has denied in the slave States t
States the privileges and immunitie
the Constitution; has dishonored us i
tions, by sustaining slavery and the sla
ist of the national government; has
n our national administration, nego
ion; has denied free labor its just rew
products chiefly to the restricted and
of the slave States; and now openly
and, striking down whatever is most
stitutions and laws."—*Furnished for
quest of the Convention.*

[The substance of the following spe
ed to a mass meeting, in the Diamo
the city of Pittsburgh, on Monday,
1842, and requested to be publishe
meeting.]

Mr. President:—I am calle
ion to speak to the 7th Resolu
reported by the business commit
happy, Sir, could I do justice t
believing as I do, that the doctri
ains are susceptible of the cle
feel myself cramped in two
want of ability, and second, for

The ground assumed, that lib
ade compromise with despotism
truly, by long and melancholy
history of our world is a rec
ory page of the historian ex
blood, that liberty can make no
with despotism or slavery of
and slavery are antagonistical p
o as darkness and light. No
exist between them: when brou
they will war with each other,
only cease, by the overthrow of
The history of our race, Mr. Pre
these positions *truisms;* and
our country, on the subject of s
natural operation of the contest
and slavery; and these will cont
he other shall be overthrown.
berty must.

The resolution takes the ground, "that the just expectations of our fathers have been frustrated, by the oppression of the slave power." Of this, Sir, we have the most melancholy proof. What were their expectations? What their designs, when they formed the Federal Constitution? "To form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Have these expectations been met, these designs accomplished? The answer, No, comes up from all parts of our distracted, suffering, and almost ruined country.

We have heard much about the "blessed spirit of compromise, which framed the constitution—formed this glorious Union," and the implied faith of the compact. But what were the interests compromised, and the implied faith, which our Southern brethren are continually ringing in our ears? The interests compromised were the interests of *liberty* and the interests of *slavery*, the interests of *free labor* and the *interests of slave labor.* These were the conflicting interests which contended for the mastery, and the compromise attempted to secure both, but failed, wholly failed, as we shall see presently. When the Constitution was adopted, slavery extended to all sections of the country; all the states were slave states, except one. Slavery then was not a sectional question. The interests of slave labor extended to all parts of the country, as did the interests of free labor. The only difference which then existed was this: the southern states had many slaves, the northern few. The one section had a greater interest in slavery than the other, while the north was more interested in free labor; but neither section had an exclusive interest in the *one*, or the *other*. And the means adopted to secure these conflicting interests, all sections of our common country had an interest in; but not an equal interest. This is the true state of the case, as it then existed.

We may now inquire into the means employed, or the measures adopted, to secure those conflicting interests. These we will find in the Constitution. The northern states were, for the most part, small, and the southern ones large. The first had but few slaves, the second, many. Those small states were given an equal representation in the Senate, the stable branch of the government. *See* ART. 1. SEC. 3. of the Constitution of the United States. According to this arrangement, the little State of Rhode Island had, and has, as much power in the Senate as the large State of Virginia, the mother of Presidents, whose territory

is nearly as large as the six New England States, and had then a population equal to ten-seventeenths of theirs. This was giving free labor, through the small states, power to protect its interests in the Senate, and this was then thought to be a sufficient guarantee. And the interest of slave labor was secured in this wise. The masters, whose interest slave labor was, were given representation in the Lower House for their slaves, five slaves counting as three other persons. *See Constitution*, ART. 1. SEC. 2. Now, Sir, if you wish to find the representative weight of *three* of our full grown, well fed, consequential Buckeyes, place them in the scale of representation with *five Virginia negroes*, and you have their weight to a feather. I see some, who look as if they would like to weigh more than this; but they cannot.—Why you, Sir, who have the honor to preside over the councils of this great *Liberty Convention*, are but two-fifths heavier than a southern slave.—Is it any marvel, that northern men are lightly esteemed by our southern statesmen, when some of them own as much representative weight as all the Representatives of the free States in their non-delegate citizen capacity? Surely not. This arrangement gave the slave power fourteen members on the floor of the first Congress under the Constitution, a little over one-fifth of the whole power. But this was not all. The slave power had the same number of votes for President and Vice President. *See* ART. 2. SEC. 1. And for this power, they were to pay tax to the support of the general government, in the same proportion. Direct taxes and representation were always to be equal. These were the measures adopted to secure the conflicting interests of *free* and *slave* labor. These are the principles of the compromise. And these fourteen Representatives, which have increased until they are now TWENTY-FIVE, and will be THIRTY in the next Congress, according to the Apportionment Bill passed by the House, and now in the Senate,* I will denominate the Prætorian guard of the slave-power.—Thus the slave power obtained a great increase of power in the Lower House, the popular branch of Congress, for which they were to pay in the support of the general government. This lessened the expenses of free labor; for the more slavery gave, the less liberty would have to give. Thus, free labor obtained an increase of power in the Senate, and a decrease of the burthen of supporting the general government, and the slave power an increase of power in the Lower House, and in the electoral college; for which more than their proportion of the burden of the government was to be borne. These are the principles of compromise, as laid down in the Constitution. These are the principles we hear so much about.

*The Senate did not agree to the ratio fixed by the House; but increased it to 70,680, which gives the slave power 21 members on the floor of Congress for their slaves, and the same number of votes for President and Vice President.

I will now call the attention of the Convention to the implied faith of the compact, about which we hear so much. What is that implied faith? Is it that slavery must live forever? No, Sir.—When the Convention which formed the Constitution was in session, it was proposed to give Congress power to abolish slavery in the states; but, if I mistake not, South Carolina and Georgia were opposed to this proposition, and argued that the states could each, for itself, abolish slavery more safely and advantageously, than the general government could do it for all the states; and the *ten* yielded to the *two*, and left the abolition of slavery to the states, with the understanding, that the states would abolish it. This is the implied faith of the compact. Not that slavery should become the corner stone of the republican edifice; but that it should cease, for ever cease—not by the action of the general government, but by the states. When the Constitution was adopted, slavery was regarded as a fast waning system. This connection was universal—Washington, Jefferson, Henry, Grayson, Tucker, Madison, Wythe, Pendleton, Lee, Mason, Page, Randolph, Iredell, Pinkney, L. Martin, and nearly all the illustrious names South of the Potomac, proclaimed it in the face of day. And it was urged in the Convention that formed the United States Constitution, that the word *slave* should not be used in it. So that "*when slavery should cease*, there might remain upon our National Charter no record that it had ever been." And, Sir, what did this implied faith lead to? To the abolition of slavery in *six* of the old *thirteen states*.—All the states but South Carolina and Georgia took hold of the subject in good earnest, and the result is as just stated; Anti-Slavery Societies were formed, or those already formed made more effective, in these states; and even Virginia and North Carolina had powerful societies: the last named State had one with *forty* auxiliaries; and these states ere this would have been free states, had not slavery pursued the course complained of in the resolution. This I will show more clearly presently. The implied faith of the compact was that slavery should cease; that this foul stain should be removed from the escutcheon of our country; not by Congress, but by the States. Yes, sir, this is the implied faith about which we hear so much. I repeat it, sir, this is the implied faith, and had I the power, I would sound it in the ears of every American; yea, of every slaveholder. But has the south redeemed this plighted faith? *No*, verily, no! They have violated this faith; they have thereby afflicted the free labor of the country very greatly, as we shall see presently, and are now adding insult to injury, by demanding the perpetuity of what they were bound to abolish, in the most insolent manner, and treating with the utmost indignity every effort to induce them to redeem their plighted faith.

So much for the compromise, and so much for the implied faith of the compact. Having thus

127632

stated the principles of the compromise, I will proceed to notice how the power thus conceded to the slave interest has operated for the benefit of slave labor, and the hurt of freemen's rights and interests.

Our government is composed of *three departments: Legislative, Judicial* and *Executive.*—What influence has slavery exerted over these departments? I will take the last first, and point out some of the effects it has had on this department. The Executive is a very powerful branch of the government. To this belongs the appointing power—power to appoint foreign ministers, and more than a swarm of home dependants, who, being the creatures of his will, *are the creatures of his will*—the servants of his interests. True, many of these appointments are subject to ratification by the Senate; but that body cannot originate. Add to this, the Executive has the veto power, which the present incumbent seems disposed to use freely, to the no small grief of his friends, and to some small degree of pleasure to his enemies. By the investment of this power the Legislative department is held in check, and it takes two thirds to carry a bill over the will of the Executive. This is a powerful department of the government. The slave power has had from fourteen to twenty-five votes for President from the formation of the government to the present time. These votes are extra, over and above their just ratio of free population. Here we have *the* reason of the courtesy of our presidential candidates to the south. Mr. Van Buren pledged himself to the south, that he would veto any bill for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; and General Harrison manufactured speeches for two markets; for southern slaveholders and northern abolitionists. Why this cringing to the south, this giving up of manliness, and bowing of the neck? The slave power has a blunderbuss which shoots *twenty-five* bullets, and be assured, Mr. President, it is no small matter to have this southern ordnance fired at an aspirant for the highest gift of a free and powerful nation; and it is quite an object to have it pour its twenty-five slugs at an opponent; hence the mighty struggle, in the campaign of 1840, to secure the service of this *great gun.* Mr. Van Buren was selected by one party, and General Harrison by the other, both from free states, but both in the interest of slavery. The one pledged to veto the abolition of slavery in the district of Columbia, and the other a favorite son of the old dominion, who had always acted with the south, when called to act on the subject. The tail of one ticket was made of R. M. Johnson, of slave holding Kentucky, a regular built southern amalgamationist—an aboveboard one, and that of the other of John Tyler, a Virginia slave holder, and slave breeder. But I believe it is now generally concluded, that this tail does not make a good head; no wonder—the tail was not made of the right sort of material, for any good thing. I would advise my Whig friends, the next time they make a tail, be sure to take material that will make a head also, should occasion call for it. But do not misunderstand me. I do not say what I do of the honorable gentleman from Kentucky, by way of *comparative* reproach. Not so: he ought not to be named in the same day with many other southern statesmen. They too have black wives; they too have yellow children; they are just as bad in these respects as R. M. Johnson. But, sir, there is this difference: he had a dark complected woman for a wife, and he treated her as a man should treat his wife; he had colored offspring, and he acted the part of a father to them. I confess, sir, I have no admiration for his taste; it would not be mine, under any circumstances I can think of; but as it was his taste, he is entitled to credit, for treating as a husband should his dark deary, and as a father should his own children. This man must not be classed with those who sell the mother of their own children, to be the accomplice of another's guilt; their own offspring for slaves; their own daughters for prostitutes. No, sir; the "Green Crossings of Kentucky" must not be classed with such men. I have more respect for him, than for many of his southern brother patriarchs, though I do not, cannot admire his taste.

But we do not only see our presidential candidates bowing low at the foot of the slave power, but we see that power filling the presidential chair. Out of fifty-two years, that chair has been filled forty by slaveholders, and twelve by men from free states; and four of those twelve by a man (Mr. Van Buren) as much under the power of the south as any slaveholding President ever was: so we may say that the Executive has been in the interest of slave labor forty-four years out of fifty-two. The free states are about two-thirds of the free population of this nation. The one third have had the Executive in its interest FORTY-FOUR years out of fifty-two, and the presidential chair has been filled forty years of this time by slaveholders. Is this a fair shake? I see No in many countenances, and I hear No from different parts of the house, and it will not be long, sir, until a No, that will make the knees of despotism tremble, will be heard through the length and breadth of the land. May the time make haste.

But it may be contended, that it matters not where the executive is from, so he is a good man. This may be, and it may not be. If it matters not what portion of the country the Executive branch of the government is from, it cannot be of much importance where the Legislature is from. And on this principle we may just as well hold no elections for Congress, and let the south manage this department of the government also. They will do it, if we will bear the expense. Yes, Sir, they will make our laws and execute them too, if we will pay them well for so doing. What say you, fellow citizens, to this? Are you willing that the slave power shall control the legislation of the country? You may as well, or at least they have

done it, but you may not have known it. You look indignant at the bare mention of giving up your part in the law making department of the government. And what, I ask again, is the difference between controlling the Executive and the Legislature, so far as our interest is concerned? The difference *betwixt tweedle dum and tweedle dee.*

But that we have an interest in the executive department of the government will appear from the manner in which that department has managed the diplomacies of the nation. Our diplomatic agents have been instructed, *time* and *again*, to negociate with the governments of Europe, to have the duty on *rice*, *cotton* and *tobacco* reduced, to favor the growers of these articles; and the duty on *cotton*, the *great staple of the south*, now pays but 70 cts. on the cwt., in the Custom Houses of Great Britain; and the duty on rice is not of much importance, yet enough for our present executive to call the attention of Congress to it, in his annual message. But no instructions have been given to negociate for the reduction of duty on corn; while these duties amount to a prohibition—in some states of the market to $5 on the barrel of flour. The barrel of flour which cost here $5, and cost $2 to take it there, is eaten by the English or Irish laborers at $12. Thus the grain of the free states, amounting to near two hundred millions of bushels, is shut out of foreign markets, and not one word is heard from our slaveholding executive. Do not be alarmed, Sir, at the sound of 200,000,000 of bushels: this state will produce this year, should the present crop be safely harvested, between 25 and 30 millions of wheat, besides corn and rye in abundance—in all more than one fourth of that amount. But this is not all, nor is it the worst. We heard last night, Sir, from our candidate for Governor, Judge King, that our Minister to England, Mr. Stevenson, attended a meeting of the corn law party, and advised the continuation of these duties. And, Sir, the Judge made this assertion, with the document in hand to prove it. But why this, you may inquire? Yes, truly, we may inquire why this—our minister advising the prohibition of the staple of two-thirds of the free people of his government, from the ports of a foreign power?—This is truly strange, but it is not inexplicable.—The cotton and sugar states buy, for the most part, their grain from the more northern states, and if this grain cannot find a market abroad, it will soon become a drug at home, and the southern planters will be able to buy it cheap—feed their slaves cheap—make cotton cheap. Here, Sir, is the key that unlocks the whole mystery.—But I will call attention to another point. I have not the data to show how the executive has favored the interest of slavery in appointing to all offices. I wish I had: but of the fourteen foreign ministers and charges de affaires appointed by our present Chief Magistrate, *eleven* are from slave states—*two-thirds* of the people have *three*, and *one-third eleven*. Is this a fair shake?

The Secretary of State is one of the most important functionaries of the government, having charge of our foreign relations. This important office has been filled *ten* times out of fifteen by a slaveholder: hence the frequent negociation with foreign courts for the surrender of fugitives from labor, and the neglect of the interests of free labor. Out of twenty-seven Judges of the Supreme Court, seventeen have been from slave states.—The North has not had a Chief Justice since 1801. The Attorney General, the constitutional adviser of the President, has been from the slave states, twelve times out of seventeen. The one-third have had twelve, and the two-thirds five. Nor can I stop yet, sir. The executive has negotiated treaties with the Indians, which have compromitted our character as a nation, and burdened us with enormous expenses. The Florida war was the consequence of some of these unjust and disgraceful treaties—a war which has cost the nation more than the last war with England, in dollars and cents, and in reputation, more than any people, civilized or savage, ever paid. Why, Sir, the very name, the blood hound war, will be a national leprosy. Must history record, shall future generations read, that the sons of those fathers who baptised Bunker's Mount with the virgin blood of freedom; who won freedom's race with foot marks of blood; around whose names settles a halo of glory brighter than the fires of Lexington, were made the companions of dogs—adorned a canine regiment with their fathers', yea, more, with freedom's flag; fought freedom's battles under the wide spreading wings of the American Eagle, rank and file with long eared, slavering Cuban dogs; companions in arms, in freedom's holy war, with *Captain Jowler, Major Tray and Colonel Bowser?* Was ever a nation so disgraced? Why Sir, every feeling of my heart is roused to indignation. I am an American; America is my country; my earthly destinies, my time born hopes are inseparable from this my home, and this the home of my children. And shall I not feel when her honor is humbled in the dust, when the brightness of her noon-tide glory is shrouded in blackness. I must feel—I will feel; and, could I inspire my countrymen with the feelings of my heart, they would fly to the rescue, and lift the fallen honor of our country, and set her glory on high. Now, I leave this convention to decide whether the free laborers of the free states, and of the slave states also, have not suffered much from the executive department of the government being in the interest of slavery, and if this department ought not to be in the interest of free labor, at least two thirds of the time.

I will next call the attention of the convention to the judicial department of the government, in which we will have a still more clear view of the influence of a slavery executive. The Supreme Court of the United States is the constitutional expounder of all laws, both constitutional and legislative. What that Court says is law is law;

what it says is constitution is constitution; from its decision there is no appeal. This august tribunal is composed of nine Judges. These Judges are appointed by the President, subject to the concurrence of the Senate. But the Senate cannot originate an appointment: they must concur with the President, or the office must remain vacant. It is with the President to say who shall be Judge, subject to the concurrence of the Senate.

The officers of this department are made by the President, and thus the Executive, in one sense, controls the Judiciary. There have been *twenty-seven* Judges appointed to that Court, *seventeen* of whom were from slave states. Thus the *one-third* has had *seventeen*, and the *two-thirds ten*. There are nine Judges on the Supreme Bench; *five* are from slave states, and *four* from free states. The *one-third* of the people have *four-ninths* of this branch of the government, and the *two thirds* but *four-ninths*. Is this a fair shake! I hear, No, and I see some Noes in the countenances of many present, which are silent Noes. They are too big for utterance, filled with indignation. With your leave, Mr. President, I will call them indignation mutes, which will break silence at the ballot box.

But, Sir, this is not all. The Chief Justice has been from a slave state for forty years; since 1801. When the venerable Marshall died, as a matter of course, his successor ought to have been from a free state. But not so: no one would or did suit Gen. Jackson but Mr. Taney, a Maryland slaveholder, who was not among the most distinguished jurists of the country; but he was a slaveholder, yea, more, a Roman Catholic; and it was thought that his appointment would unite the Catholics in his favor at the then coming election. I do not mention his religion out of disrespect. I proscribe no man on account of his religion, but to show the working of political craft. Now, Sir, is it a matter of no interest to the free states, that this important branch of the government should have been always in the interest of slavery? Is this no concern of ours? Yes, Sir, we are deeply interested, our posterity are interested, our country is interested; let us remember these interests at the ballot box.

I might show, Sir, how the honor of the Supreme Court has been tarnished by conflicting decisions relative to slavery, in the great Mississippi case, and in the case of Maryland and Pennsylvania, but time will not permit. I must forego this, and will next call the attention of the convention to the influence of the slave power over the Legislative department of the Government.

This department is composed of a Senate and House of Representatives. The Vice President of the United States is President of the Senate. The House elects the presiding officer. When the Vice President is absent, the Senate elects a President pro tempore. There have been about 400 elections to fill this office, and near one hundred different persons have been President pro tem. of the Senate, since the formation of the government. The same person has filled the office frequently. If I mistake not, Mr. King, of Alabama, was elected *ten* times: but I will not be positive, as I speak from memory, and the exact number in any of these points is of no importance to the argument; I can be near enough to elucidate the matter in hand. Of the whole number of Presidents pro tem., about sixteen have been from the free states, and all the rest of the hundred, or near a hundred, from the slave states.

The Speaker of the Lower House of Congress is one of the most inportant functionaries of this department of the Government. He appoints all the standing committees to whom the interests of the country are committed, decides points of order, subject to an appeal to the House; and gives the floor to speakers, subject to a like appeal.—We have had, if I mistake not, twenty-nine Speakers of Congress, TWENTY of whom have been from the slave states, and only NINE from the free states. The *one-third* has had TWENTY, and the *two-thirds* NINE; and this chair has been filled by a slaveholder, with but one single exception, since 1819. In the last *thirty-two* years the *one-third* has had the *office* in their service THIRTY years, and the *two-thirds* TWO years. Were all these things the result of mere accident? or is the hand of Joab in all this? I see many look astonished at the announcement of these facts, but we shall see the explication of all this presently.

I will now proceed to notice some of the laws passed, for I cannot notice all, to favor the interests of slave labor. I will pass over the first seventeen years of the government, and commence at 1807. In this year the embargo was laid. This was done by the South and West, and done, too, to the great injury of the North. The North was then engaged extensively in foreign trade; our commerce was in a very prosperous state. But John Bull and Bonaparte had treated us amiss, and to get satisfaction of them, all the Yankee noses down east had to be cut off to spite their faces, our trade ruined, and our shipping left to rot.—Next we were plunged into a war which increased our national debt, and cost thousands of lives and much general distress—a war which did not gain us one foot of territory, or any thing else, that I know of; but I only notice these to prepare the way for something more important, and will therefore not dwell.

By the embargo, non-intercourse law, and the war, our commercial relations were broken off with the commercial world, for near nine years, from 1807 to 1816; during this time we were left to our own resources, and, to use a Buckeye phrase, it was "root, hog, or die." The foreign goods which had been imported before this interruption of commerce were all consumed before 1816; and we were driven by necessity to provide for ourselves, and spinning, weaving and fulling became the order of the day. Linsey was spun and woven by the wives and daughters of

that time, and so were flannels: these were taken to the fulling mills, and fulled, dyed and dressed; and fulled linsey and homespun fulled cloth became common for men, and in their undressed state were worn by women. Jeans were made for men, which cost nothing to full and dress. Our bowls and dishes were made in many instances by our mud potters, and they were no great beauties, I assure you, sir: yes, and noggins were also used. I have seen noggins; and, all in all, we were reduced to a very plain democratic style. During this period, necessity, the mother of invention, induced many to commence manufacturing on a small scale, to make finer fabrics than the ordinary homespun, and some indispensables which could not be made without machinery. Thus a number of manufacturing establishments sprung up in different parts of the country, and considerable investments were made in home manufactories. These answered a valuable purpose, we could not have gotten along without them, or at least not gotten along well.

When peace was obtained, and our commercial relations with the old world restored, these infant manufactories were about to be prestrated: they could not compete with the large capital, the improved skill, and the low price of labor in foreign countries; and these establishments, which had rendered us such important service, must sink, and those who had invested capital in them suffer great loss. This state of things gave rise to the conception of a protective tariff, to protect our home industry. It was then said, I know not with how much truth, that Mr. Jefferson changed his views on this subject in 1814—that, up to that time, he contended that the true interests of this country consisted in cultivating the earth, and exchanging our agricultural productions for the manufactures of other climes; but then he came into the opinion, that we ought to be a manufacturing as well as an agricultural people. The north resisted the tariff, on the ground that it would injure their trade. The northern Federalists were then the advocates of free trade. Out of the thirty-six northern votes in 1816, but ten voted for the tariff. The south then went for high tariff: it was the darling child of democracy, southern democracy. I seriously suspect, Sir, that the ten Yankee votes were all democratic, for there were at time some democrats in the North. The tariff of sixteen, twenty-four, twenty-eight, thirty-two, and even the compromise of thirty-three, were all passed by Democrats, and signed by Democratic Presidents. And what, sir, do we find after all this? The Democrats bawling out against high tariff, and for free trade. If past acts prove any thing, the Democrats are the tariff party. Sir, I am a tariff man, and an old Jeffersonian, Virginia Democrat, and because I have not changed my creed, I am no longer in favor with the patent Democracy of this day. I fear, sir, that politics change like fashions. I read, not long since, of an old lady, 102 years old: she had been married about her twentieth year, and on her birth day, and more than eighty years after her marriage day, she put on her wedding gown, which she had kept, and it was in the very tip of the fashion; and this was not all, it had been in fashion several times previously. I do not know that my tariff creed will come in fashion as often as the old lady's gown; but one thing I do know—what was the very height of the fashion with Federalists when I was a young man, is now all the go with patent Democracy. And why this change? Because their southern masters bid them. They have undertaken to do the slaveholders' work with keenest zest. But, sir, I have not risen to make a tariff speech; I will proceed no further on this point.

The tariff of sixteen was a southern measure, gotten up to protect the manufactories which had sprung up during the embargo and war; and this policy was an invitation to capitalists to invest their capital in manufactories. I want this matter distinctly stated. The manufacturers did not ask the government for protection; the government extended protection unasked, and thus invited the capitalists to manufacture. I wish this to be carefully noted. Thus the faith of the general government was pledged to give such protection as would make what might be invested reasonably productive. The faith of the nation was pledged to this; pledged to her own citizens—pledged in the most solemn manner.

The south made protection the ostensible reason for the tariff; but we will be able to find another, and a powerful reason. The government was to be supported by direct tax. This would subject the slave holders to pay tax for their negro representation in Congress; and though they had tried to avoid the operation of direct taxes, by excise and duties on foreign goods, previous to 1816, they had not entirely succeeded. In '16, when the protecting tariff was passed, the direct tax act was repealed; and from that day to this, the south have not paid one *red cent* for their negro representation in Congress; and have slipped out of from thirty to forty millions of the expenses of the government, which they were to pay for their slave representation; while they still keep the representation; and this immense sum has fallen on us—on free laborers. If the government should now be supported according to the provisions of the Constitution—by direct tax, as it was originally intended to be, in the main, the slave states would have to pay *two millions seven hundred thousand dollars* annually, extra, over their proportion, as free citizens of the country. For their twenty-five members are a little over one-*tenth* of the representation of Congress, and this sum is but the one-tenth of the present expenses of the government; and the Constitution provides that direct taxes and representation shall be equal; each state shall pay in proportion to its representation. *See* Constitution, Art. 1. Sec. 2. Now, sir, this is no small sum to save, for the card table, or race course.

And what do we hear about the compromise,

that formed this arrangement? Why are these changes rung upon our ears?—"the blessed spirit of compromise that formed this glorious union;" "the blessed bargain;" "the glorious bargain;" "stick to the bargain," &c. But what was the bargain—"the blessed bargain?" Why, sir, the slave power was to have twenty-five votes in Congress, and the same number for President and Vice President; for which they were to pay, in support of the general government, $2,700,000. This is the bargain, as the matter now stands.—But they have both sides of this "blessed bargain," and this makes it so very blessed to them, they have the representation and the money too. Let me illustrate this case: I sell you my horse for $100; you are to have the horse, and I the $100; this is the bargain; I get the money, and put it in my pocket, and by some device you get the hundred dollars out of my pocket, and put it into yours, mount the horse, and canter off with horse and money both; I call to you, stop, Mr., there is a mistake in this business; you were to have the horse, and I the $100; but you have both; come! come! this will not do, the matter must be set right. You reply, stick to the bargain! Oh the bargain! "The blessed bargain!" "The glorious bargain!" Stick to the bargain. But I reply, the bargain was this: you were to have the horse, and I the hundred dollars; this was the bargain; stick to it. But you put spurs to the horse, and off you go, singing and shouting, "stick to the bargain;" and I run after you, almost out of breath, demanding compliance with the bargain, or something equivalent. Just at this stage, up comes my good friend, who sits here on my right, and with almost more than parental kindness, tries to take me in his arms, and says to me, Oh, Edward, let him have it his own way, or he will ride the poor horse to death. He will ruin the horse if you say anything more about it; let him have both; Oh, do let him have it his own way, or *he will kill the horse*, and then you will have neither horse nor money. So, when we wish to bring the government back to its original design, to protect and secure the interests of freemen—to place slavery where the Constitution places it, the south flies into a rage, mounts the noble steed Constitution, and gallops off, singing, stick to the bargain, and our Whig and Democratic friends come, like my friend, and say, O, let them have it their own way, or they will ride the horse to death—they will ruin the Constitution. Why, it is string-halted and spavined now. O, say no more to them, or it will be ruined. But, sir, we cannot listen to these kind friends: we have too much stake in our country; we must have a new rider for this noble steed, or all will be lost, irrecoverably lost.

But, sir, while the south got their heads out of the halter of paying tax for their negro representation, how did they regard the rights of free labor? The tariff of 1816 did not only free the south from paying extra taxes, but from paying equal taxes also. The coarse linens used for the clothing of slaves, the coarse cloth called negro cloth, worn by slaves, and the coarse blankets used for overcoats or beds, as the slaves choose, were admitted at $5 on the $100 worth; while the linens, cloths and blankets used by free laborers, yea, the blankets used in northern poor houses, were made to pay from $20, to $30 on the $100 worth. Thus the freeman of the north or south had to pay *from four to six times* as much duty on $100 worth of clothing for himself as the slave holder had to pay for the same to clothe his slaves. Shall we be told, sir, we have nothing to do with this?—that it is no concern of ours? that the south have not only made us pay what they were to pay for their negro representation in Congress, but from $4 to $6 to their one of the balance of the expenses? Well, sir, this may be told us; but we are not bound to believe it, and we will not believe it. No, sir, I would not believe it if I could. But, sir, the tariff of '16 was a southern measure, and these points were settled by it. Did slavery then control the legislative department of the government for its benefit and our disadvantage? Who can doubt, in the face of these facts? No, one, surely no one!

But this will appear, if possible, still more evident, from a further survey of this subject. In 1816, when the tariff was established, the second United States Bank was chartered, with power to put into circulation over 100,000,000 dollars. This, with the aid of other banks, doubled the money of the country by 1824; and, as the money increased, the price of property increased in the same ratio; so that, in these eight years, the expense of manufacturing became double what it was in '16, and the tariff of that time was no longer a sufficient protection, and duties had to be increased. But what section favored this increase? The north had accommodated itself to the policy of the government, and at this time the air of the free states was darkened by the smoke of more than one thousand chimneys. The English, Irish, Scotch, and Welsh, who came to this country to carry on these manufactories, were like a good many others—they "did not like a negro, no how;" and settled in the free states, and there established these manufactories, and they became, to a great extent, sectional. The air of the south was not darkened with smoke, or at least not to much extent. There the sun shone as clear as ever: but not so in the free states.—Why, sir, we have not had one clear day in Pittsburgh, where I live, for many years, and our brightest time-born hope is never to have another: our *brightest* prospect is a cloud of smoke.—The tariff which the south forced on the north had become water to the Yankee's mill, and by 1824 the south began to demur to the increasing of the stream. But the nation's faith was pledged to protect home manufactures, and the tariff was raised. But on we went, making paper money, and in 1828 it had to be raised again, and also in 1832. The increase of the money made the in-

cease of the tariff indispensable. But before this time the south became clamorous in their opposition to the tariff. Threats of disunion were publicly made, and to reconcile the south to their own course of policy, the tariff of 1832 admitted, free of duty, the negro cloth, or the wool of which it was made, for we manufactured it at that time, and the linen of which the slave's shirts and pants were made; and from 1832 to the present, a period of ten years, the slaveholders have paid no duty on anything consumed by slaves, except salt; and Mr. Benton has spent as much time to have salt duties reduced, as cost the nation more than all collected from the negro's salt would amount to. But, sir, it was, it is too much for the moral, the amiable christian slaveholder, to have to whip his lazy negroes until they are raw from neck to heels, and then have to pay duty on salt to salt them. It is too much, sir, for any living man to have to pay duty on salt to salt *live meat*; and we must excuse Mr. Benton. Now, sir, have the north nothing to do with this? Nothing to do with a policy which not only lets the slave power out of the burden of the compromise, but exonerates 2,500,000 of southern laborers from any support of the government, except the little duty on salt, and throws the whole burden on us?

But I think I hear a Whig say all this was done by the Democratic party, for they were then in power; and for these sins against freedom and free labor they ought to be put down; and you abolitionists ought to unite with us in the good work—the redemption of the country. Hold! are the Whigs clear in this matter? I trow not. The campaign of 1830, which beat all creation, and scared the coons, was gotten up for the special relief of the country; and an extra session was called for this purpose, which resolved to entertain no business but what was recommended by the President for this very object. But what did that Whig Relief Congress do, for the relief of our suffering country? Nothing, worse than nothing. The Relief Congress and the Relief President could not agree on measures for the relief of the country, but they found no difficulty in agreeing on a measure to favor slavery. The Compromise Bill was to take effect the first of July, 1842. This Bill charged twenty per centum advalorem on all foreign articles, without discrimination; and under its operation, coarse wool and coarse linen would be tariffed 20 per centum, and the slaveholder would have to pay duty to the government for the clothing of his slaves. This must not be; and though the regular session would commence within a few days of seven months before the time this would take place, the extra session, *the Relief Session*, found time to care for slavery, and passed a "bill of duties and drawbacks," by which the coarse wool and linen are to be admitted free of duty. So that, under the Compromise, the slaveholders will have to pay no tax for their 2,500,000 laborers, except for salt. Now ought we to unite with the Whigs to put down the Democrats, or with truth and righteousness, liberty and equal rights, and put them both down. Surely with the last: and this, by the aid of the Preserver of men, we will do. Yes, Sir, we will do it; we will, I hear from different parts of the house!!

But I must call the attention of the convention to the Compromise Act before I leave this part of the subject. When was this act passed, by whom was it passed, and what were its effects on the country, are all questions of the very first importance.

We have already called attention to the fact, that the south openly threatened disunion, if the high tariff was not given up: South Carolina called a convention, which passed resolutions instructing the Legislature of that state to secede, and organize a separate government, if Congress should attempt to collect high duties in their ports; and this *scare crow* has been kept in the field, until it will scare the crows no longer. Why, Sir, last winter an old Yankee crow lit on the head of this beauty, and cried *croak*, with the Haverhill petition, and every bone in its body was instantly broken, and every joint dislocated by the weight of this monstrous crow; and down it sunk, in utter ruin, to plague the nation no more. We are done with this, Sir. Why, Sir, when a few old Quakers and others, from Haverhill, asked the south to do what they had been threatening to do for ten years, they were instantly alarmed, and Judge Underwood, of Kentucky, acknowledged that to dissolve the Union was to abolish slavery; for they could not keep their slaves any longer that the Union lasted. This we all said from the first; but we were not believed. I hope we will be now, when we are borne out by the slaveholders themselves. And, Sir, to show their regard for the Union they had been threatening to destroy, they proposed to punish by severe censure the venerable Ex-President for presenting a petition, though he had given notice at the time that he was opposed to the prayer. And so intent were they on it, that he was put on his trial before the House. But that was a dear trial to them. Never did men get such a castigation. Poor Marshall, he will never forget it! No, never!! But, Sir, it was a glorious one to him, whose like we shall never see again. I have always been an admirer of Mr. Adams, of his unexampled talents, and fixed virtues; but, Sir, I did not know the man.—His defence before the House exhibited the man. There we see John Quincy Adams, the intellectual sun of this hemisphere, not in the dazzling glare of noonday attitude, contracted into brightness which we cannot look upon; but in the calmness of evening, where he shows out larger, milder, and every way more glorious, as he hastes to set for ever from our sight. Sir, that was a glorious day, a day which made known to the nation the patriot of Quincy. All that I regret is, that the trial was arrested; that he was not permitted to finish his defence. He ought not to have given place for a motion to lie on the table. He

owed to his country, to freedom's holy cause, to humanity's dearest rights, to have left as a last and best legacy his whole defence. But, Sir, his love of the country, of which he is the brightest ornament, is his excuse. He did it to save time, that the measure of his country's relief might be the sooner reached.

This Compromise bill had Gen. Jackson for its father, and Mr. Clay for its mother; a monster birth, you may be sure. Gen. Jackson had been elected in 1828, by the arguments, at least in part, of hickory poles and sticks—strange reasons; and now, sir, these hickory club logicians are inveighing against the log cabin and coon skin campaign, and calling the Whigs fools. But, sir, their folly consisted in being greater fools than the others; and this well entitles them to this appellation.—The campaign of '40 was nothing but an improved and enlarged edition of that of '28. I give the Whigs credit for beating their opponents with their own weapons. They did, sir, and they did it in style; and the Democrats ought to acknowledge it. But, sir, while this is all true, and somewhat amusing, another thing is true, but is free from all music, but that of sighs and groans: these parties have well nigh beaten the nation's brains out with their hickory clubs and buckeye canes. I hope we will have no more of them.

Gen. Jackson was elected to reform the extravagant minority administration of John Quincy Adams, which had cost the nation $12,000,000 annually. This was too much for the dear people to bear. The politicians loved the *dear* people so much, that they could not rest day or night, until relief was obtained for them. Yes, Sir, they love you very much—they love one spot more than all the rest; yes, Sir, they love in spots. The spot they love most is the pocket. The General was elected to reform this extravagance, and bring the government back to Democratic simplicity; and after laboring eight years at this praiseworthy object, without being able to effect it, Mr. Van Buren was selected to walk in the footsteps of his *Illustrious Predecessor*. While the General ruled, it was glory enough for Mr. Van Buren to serve under him; and when he would rule no longer, he then aspired to walk in his footsteps. But, Sir, what was done in these twelve years of reform and retrenchment? Why, Sir, the government was reformed from *thirteen* millions, *all* the way down to *twenty-seven* millions, and retrenched *fourteen millions* bigger! Was not this a reform and retrenchment well worthy of poles and clubs?

But, Sir, when the beauties of this reformation began to appear, the Whigs were so charmed with it, that they raised the shout of reform and retrenchment, and they set about reforming the reformation in good earnest, and succeeded as we have seen, with the powerful arguments of coon skins, &c. I will call them the *reformers reformed*. And, Sir, where have the new reformers led us? Why, Sir, Mr. Forward, our present Secretary of the Treasury, estimates the expenses of the government at *twenty-seven millions* annually yet. So, Sir, we have not mended the matter in this respect.

Now, Sir, we see how much these political reformers and reformers reformed love the *dear* people—they have loved just *fourteen millions of dollars annually* out of your pockets, for the last five years. This is reformation with a vengeance. Did they not love? Can you doubt their love? their love of the spot called pocket? If you can, your bump of credulity must be very low.

General Jackson was also elected as a tariff candidate; he was in favor of a judicious tariff, and Mr. Clay was the father of the American, the protecting system. When the General became president, he found it necessary to define his judicious tariff, which was, when defined, "*a tariff for revenue, and not for protection*," and Mr. Clay's bill took the very same ground: made no discrimination in favor of our manufactures—twenty per centum, ad valorem, on all imported articles—on what we could make, and what we could not make. This was an entire abandonment of the protective system, by its honored father, who had volunteered to give birth to General Jackson's awful conception. And this bill was passed by the South—the ten states south of Mason and Dixon's line, leaving out Missouri, gave but one vote against this bill. These ten states went for the Compromise, with the exception of a single vote. This answers the question by whom was it passed, and settles it too.

THE TIME. This bill was passed in 1833, when we had above four times as much money as we had in 1816, when the South forced the tariff on the North, and when property was four times the price it was then, and manufacturing carried on at the same increase of expenses, or nearly so. When the tariff of *thirty-two* did not, by reason of the great increase of money, and the corresponding increased expense of manufacturing, give sufficient protection, this was the time when the tariff was brought down to suit the South.

THE EFFECT. This, Sir, is the last thing to notice, on this branch of the subject. The first thing I will notice is the prostration of our manufactories, and the other employments of the country. The number of persons, (as per the last census,) employed in the different callings, is 4,904,832. This gives about 4 1-5 persons to be supported by each one employed. The number employed in manufactories and trades is 791,245—600,611 of these are in the free states, and 190,934 in the slave states. This gives 3,322,869 to be supported by those engaged in manufactories and trades, 2,582,366 of whom are in the free states. Now, sir, is it a small matter, that an interest be prostrated on which so many millions depend for bread? But, Sir, according to Mr. Saltonstall's report on manufactures, during the present Congress, nearly or quite two hundred millions of dollars of capital are invested in these

manufactures. Is it a small matter that this vast sum should be rendered dead to its owners, and unproductive to the nation? Must "lullaby" be sung to the cross brat of oppression, to the tune of all this? But, be not frightened; these are tender mercies compared to what remains to be told.

The prostration of our manufactures did not only turn thousands of honest men and women out of employ, leaving their families to suffer; (yea, men entered the army and navy for bread, and some virtuous women were induced to abandon themselves to prostitution for a crust; and all this in this land of plenty; the sufferings of the manufacturing districts cannot well be told;) but sent us to foreign countries for the productions of art, and, by the lowering of the tariff, opened this country, and let in a deluge of the contents of the European workshops, so that in seven years from the passage of this Compromise, the balance of trade against this country was $199,000,000, in round numbers. This, Sir, was for merchandise, not for money to make internal improvements. Be this kept in mind. These goods were cheap, cheaper than we could make them, and all hands went to buying; and in 1837, some of them had to be paid for. But, how could this be done? In gold and silver; our paper money, of which we had an abundance, would not pay one dollar. This money had to be taken to the banks, and converted into gold and silver, and then sent out of the country, to maintain the credit of our merchants abroad. These merchants had the means of getting any quantity of bank money. Like the great Gulf of Mexico, into which all our streams find a way, the money found a way to them, the great receivers; and they took it to the banks, and drew the gold and silver, to maintain their credit abroad; and so heavy were these draws, that in 1837, the Dry Dock Bank, in New York, had but about $1000 in her vaults; and the other banks in that city were drained nearly as dry as this dry one; and those in Philadelphia, were not much more flush. When the specie in the Dry Dock Bank was all drawn out to the above sum, it concluded it would not do to bank with less specie in its vaults, and closed, shut its doors, to keep what it had; and as soon as the sound thereof was heard, the other banks in that city followed suit. The next day, the mail brought the news to Philadelphia, and *clap, clap*, went the banks there, and in less than two weeks the banks took the *claps* all over the country, and every dollar of gold and silver they had was closed up in their vaults, and we, the people, had from three to four hundred millions of irredeemable paper currency; and thus the currency of the country became what we have seen it. The reduction of the tariff to please the South ruined the currency of the country. This is a plain case. But, Sir, this great evil is attributed to other causes. The Whigs say it was caused by Gen. Jackson's war on the Bank of the United States, and the Democrats say it was caused by the great increase of banking capital, or bank issues; both of which I flatly deny.

The United States Bank, and all the banks in the land, never had at any one time fifty millions of dollars in specie in their vaults, and the friends of the hard money currency estimated but about eighty millions in the country. Our merchants owed abroad four times as much as all the vaults of the banks, United States Bank included, contained; their indebtedness would have drawn from the banks every dollar four times over; and the merchants were in a situation to get notes to draw with. Now, I ask, what would the United States Bank have done in such a case? Why, Sir, suspended, like the rest. There was no alternative. It is perfectly ideal to talk of the United States Bank maintaining the currency in this state of things. Why, Sir, this foreign indebtedness would have broken five United States Banks, such as that was.

But the Democrats are no more fortunate in assigning a cause than the whigs. The increase of bank issues which produced the spirit of speculation was not the cause. This spirit was rife from 1825 to 1833, and money very plenty, though not so much so as from 1833 to 1837, but enough so to have some very perceivable effect. But the balance of trade did not overpower us in those years, simply because we had a tariff that shut it out, and kept our own manufactories in operation. This is a plain case, and proves that our Democratic friends are wholly at fault in their argument.

Had the same extravagance been indulged in, we would not have been reduced to the same embarrassments, had our manufactories been kept in operation, and foreign goods shut out. We might have used as much, and been every way as prodigal, but our own grain and meat would have been gladly taken in payment, and what those could not pay, the paper money of our banks would, and no occasion would have existed to draw the gold and silver out of the banks, and thus prostrate them. They would have retained their specie and their credit, and the caution with which they were beginning to be looked on, and the guards with which the authorities were beginning to surround them, promised to bring us through our banking folly with whole bones, but pretty badly scratched.

But, Sir, had not the balance of trade been against us, and an occasion thus given to draw off the precious metals, the specie would have increased. Emigrants were coming to the country, bringing quantities of it with them, and ere this time we would have had at least 120 millions of hard money in the country, as a basis for banking. Can these positions be successfully controverted? No, Sir, they are sustained by the eloquence of facts, an eloquence which lives for ever. What then, I inquire, has destroyed our currency? Was it the war on the United States Bank, or the spirit of speculating and over trading, or both together? No, Sir. What then? It was the war on

liberty, on free labor. It is the vampire Slavery, which has been sucking the very heart's blood of the nation, by which we are brought to our very deplorable state of prostration; yes, sir, and if we do not drive this insatiate monster away, it will cause our glory to fade in the morning, and our light to go out at noonday—the hope of a crushed and tyranised world to perish, in the failure of the last experiment of rational liberty. And shall we sleep any longer over this subject! I hope not.

But, Sir, I am not done with the effects of the Compromise yet, nor is my country done with them. We were engaged in a grand scheme of internal improvements. We had borrowed money from European capitalists for the most part to finish these works, and we depended on the tolls to pay a part, if not all the interest; these with taxes to pay in time interest and principal; but in a long time—for we could pay the principal when it became due by contracting another loan on longer time, and thus let the burden of our improvements spread over many years, and bear lightly on the country. And though our improvements have in many instances been badly managed, (this I freely admit,) the scheme was one of the grandest of the age, one for which posterity would load our memories with blessings. But, Sir, it has been crippled, its *honey* turned to *gall*. The derangement of the currency, and our mercantile indebtedness abroad, have ruined credit; the merchants have not been able to maintain their credit abroad; specie could not be got to pay interest on borrowed money, and thus state credit has sunk also; and as a proof of this, American stocks have depreciated forty millions in the London market—and it is said that a part of Lord Ashburton's mission is to negotiate for the benefit of these stocks, in which he is very largely interested, (being none other than Alexander Baring, the great London stock banker,) by getting the general government to assume the state debts. But, Sir, our credit is gone: we cannot get money to finish these works, some of which hundreds of thousands have been expended on, and thus are part made, but cannot be finished for want of funds, and funds cannot be had for want of credit. This is the secret. Money at this time is offered on long time in London, at three per cent. Here we are offering from *ten* to *twenty*, yea, *twenty-five*, on short time, and cannot get it. And why? We have no credit. And why no credit? Are the resources of this new and giant country exhausted? No, but its credit has been immolated on the altar of oppression. And where are we now? Paying taxes for borrowed money; which has been expended on half finished works—works which will not be finished soon, if ever. Here is a burden entailed on us, on our posterity, for which they will not bless us. And why this state of things? Is it because there is no money to be got to finish these projected works?

No!! Had we credit, we could get money to finish every mile of them, and long time to pay it in; and should we not be ready to pay when the loans might become due, we could contract others, and thus extend the time of payment; and the tolls would pay the interest, for then all the works would be productive. Those which are now finished are far less productive than they would be were all their tributaries finished. The increased production of those now finished, and the proceeds of those yet to be completed, would raise revenue enough to pay the interest, and more than the interest. Add to this a light tax, and you have the means of paying interest and principal in a way that would not be felt, and would leave to those who would come after one of the best improved countries on which the sun shines, and these improvements a source of revenue too. But, Sir, this beautiful picture, so faintly sketched, has become defaced; the blood and tears of the slave have changed its glory into night.

But the resolution says, that "slavery has continually, and in open defiance of the constitution, extended its borders and strengthened its dominion." Yes, Sir, all this it has literally done. The constitution no where gives to Congress the power to establish slavery. The amendment to the 10th article of the constitution holds this language: "The powers not delegated to the United States by this constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people." Now, Sir, I demand of the advocates of slavery, or its friends, to put their finger on the place in the constitution, where power is delegated to Congress to establish slavery, or where this power is prohibited to the states. No such place can be found, and, consequently, Congress has no power to establish slavery. Why, Sir, this is the ground taken by the South: they meet our petitions at the door of Congress, and kick them away, on the ground that Congress has no control of the subject of slavery—that slavery is a state institution, over which Congress has no control. Be it so. If Congress has no power over the subject, how comes it that slavery exists in the District of Columbia, and in the seven new states, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas and Missouri, which have all been admitted into the Union since the constitution was adopted. And these states were territories of the U. S., and governed by Congress; and when slave territories, Congress established slavery in them, as also in the District of Columbia; for when the ten miles square was ceded, Congress passed a law, making the laws of Maryland and Virginia the laws of the District, until others should be made. Now, Sir, where did Congress get power or authority to do all this? to plant the rich valley of the Mississippi with slavery? Not in the constitution, I answer, but in the overreaching of the slave power. I assert fearlessly, that slavery in the new states, and the district, is not only without any authority from the constitution, but is unconstitutional.

But, Sir, why were the powers of the constitution thus transcended? Why, Sir, to form a market for the surplus slaves of the old states, and thereby to increase the price of this kind of property. I can recollect when, in Virginia, my native state, slaves sold for from $300 to $500; and then, when they sold for from $1000 to $1500. Thus, Sir, was the price of this kind of property increased, and the patriarchs of the domestic institution enabled to sell their own sons for bondmen, and their own daughters for harlots, at the prices above noticed. For this, Sir, the powers of the constitution were transcended; the charter of our sacred liberties trampled in the dust, by the bloody feet of oppression. And what was the effect of this? The great South West has become the land of the slave and the home of the fearful. Instead of six slave states, we have thirteen—twenty-six slaveholding Senators, instead of twelve. But this is not all, nor the worst either. So soon as this policy increased the price of slaves, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina abandoned their Anti-Slavery Societies, and came out for the perpetuity of slavery. Sir, Sir, had not this unholy, unconstitutional course been pursued, before this day these states would have been free, and we would have but two slave states, South Carolina and Georgia, the states which opposed giving Congress the power to abolish slavery in the states. And we would have but four senators and 12 or 15 congressmen from those states. And what would these have been among so many? Now, Sir, after this survey of facts, can any one doubt, that had slavery been confined to its ancient limits, it would have, as set forth in the resolution, perished there; and that, in open defiance of the constitution, it has been continually extending its borders, and strengthening its dominions? Surely not.

The resolution takes the ground, that slavery "has nullified and set at nought all the constitutional guaranties of our most sacred rights." This is true—true to the letter. The liberty of speech and the press, the right of petition, and the free exercise of religion, are the chief of these sacred rights; and which of these have not been cloven down by the slave power? Are we free to speak our minds on the subject of slavery, in the slave states? Are free to do it here, in a free state, or in any of the free states? Sir, I will let the blood of Lovejoy answer this question; and this answer may be corroborated by the numerous mobs of the free states, the lynching of Dresser, and the tarring and feathering of Kendall, in the slave states. Sir, slavery claims to tell "the Ohio farmer beside his plow, what he shall say, and when, and how." But permit me to read part of an act passed by the Virginia legislature, in 1836:

1. *Be it enacted by the General Assembly*—That any member of an abolition or anti-slavery society, or agent of an abolition or anti-slavery society, who shall come into this state, and shall here maintain, by speaking or writing, that the owners of slaves have no property in the same, or advocate or advise the abolition of slavery, shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be fined in a sum of not less than fifty dollars, nor more than two hundred dollars, and suffer a term of imprisonment of not less than six months, nor more than three years, at the discretion of the jury.

Now, Sir, what have we in this law? If a member of an anti-slavery society comes into the state of Virginia, and there maintains, by word or writing, that slaves are not property, or ought not to be, or shall advise their freedom, he shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and subjected to a fine of from 50 to $200, and imprisonment of from six months to three years. Fined and imprisoned for what? For doing what Washington, Jefferson, and all the worthies of the revolution did—advising the abolition of slavery.

THE PRESS.—How much better has this fared? We may print what we please, if slavery do not pull down the press, and throw it into the river.—The Philanthropist can tell something about the liberty the press enjoys; yes, sir, my distinguished friend, Dr. Bailey, who sits before me, can tell a tale on this subject. But, sir, what says the law just noticed?

"2. *And be it further enacted*—That if any person shall hereafter write, print, or cause to be written or printed, any book, pamphlet, or other writing, with intent of advising, enticing, or persuading persons of color, within this Commonwealth, to make insurrection or rebel, or denying the right of masters to property in their slaves, or inculcating the duty of resistance to such right, or shall, with intent to aid the purposes aforesaid of such book, pamphlet, or other writing, knowingly circulate, or cause to be circulated, any such book, pamphlet, or other writing, such person shall, if a slave or other colored person, be punished with stripes not exceeding thirty-nine, and transported and sold beyond the limits of the United States, under the orders of the Executive of this Commonwealth; and if a free white person, shall be deemed guilty of felony, and, on conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment in the Penitentiary of this Commonwealth, for a term not less than two years, nor more than five years.

"3. *Be it further enacted*—That if any postmaster, or deputy postmaster, within this Commonwealth, shall give notice to any Justice of the Peace, that any book, pamphlet, or other writing, hath been received at his office through the medium of the mail, of the character and description mentioned in the section of this act immediately preceding, it shall be the duty of such Justice of the Peace to inquire into the circumstances of the case, and to have such books, pamphlets, or other writings, burned in his presence; and if it shall appear to him, by satisfactory evidence, that the person to whom the same is directed, subscribed for the said book, pamphlet, or other writing, knowing its character and tendency, or agreed to receive it with an intent to circulate it, thereby to aid the purposes of the abolitionists, or anti-slavery societies, the said Justice shall commit him or her to the jail of his county, to be dealt with according to law. And any postmaster or deputy postmaster knowingly violating the provisions of this act shall forfeit and pay a sum not less than fifty dollars, nor more than two hundred dollars, to be recovered with costs, by action of debt or information, in any court of record in this Commonwealth, one moiety to the Commonwealth, for the use of the literary fund, the other to the informer, or any person who will sue for the same."

Here we have liberty of the press with a ven-

geance. To print any thing which denies the right of the master to property in the slave is a penitentiary offence. To print Mr. Wesley's Tract, or some of the writings of Mr. Jefferson, Virginia's gifted and highly honored son, would give the printer a home in her state prison for from two to five years. But, sir, this is not all: this law makes it the duty of Postmasters to give notice to a Justice of the Peace, that papers, or other documents, not just to southern taste, have reached his office, through the medium of the mail; and said Justice shall proceed and burn said papers, or documents, in the Postmaster's presence; and should the Postmaster deliver any such documents, he shall be fined from $50 to $200. And any person subscribing for such papers, or receiving them from the post office, shall be housed in the penitentiary, from two to five years. Thus, sir, while we are at liberty to print and send through the mail, i. e. if the pro-slavery mobs do not pull down our presses, or Lovejoy us, the Virginia Justice is authorized and required to burn what we print. The Postmaster is to be fined for delivering the mail, and citizens penitentiaried for receiving its contents. This is the liberty of the press which slavery has left us.

THE RIGHT OF PETITION.—Do we enjoy this right? Let the history of the past few years speak—let the 21st Rule inform us. But one may say this has reference to abolition; true, but abolition has reference to slavery; hence the rule. But I will state one case. The southern states of S. Carolina and Alabama* have passed laws to arrest and put in jail colored seamen, who come into their ports from the free states, and there keep them until the vessel is ready to clear; then the owners or captains are required to pay jail fees, and take them from the state. These laws are very oppressive on those engaged in the coasting trade. They find it to their advantage to employ colored seamen; they stand the southern climate better than white ones; and these colored men are citizens of the free states, and entitled, by the constitution of the United States, to all the privileges of citizens of the several states. But the owners of vessels are subjected by these laws to expense and inconvenience. Their hands are taken from them, and they must hire slaves to unload and load their ships, and then pay jail fees to get their men to manage the vessel on her homebound voyage. ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY of these shippers petitioned the present Whig Congress for redress of grievances, and the petition was met at the door of the House, and told, you cannot enter here; you have reference to slavery, and this House will hear nothing against it.—Now, sir, are our own seamen imprisoned in our own ports; taken from under our own flag to a stinking jail, and our petitions denied a hearing? History answers Yes. Is not this too much? But I have not told all; one case is worthy of special notice; and, I confess, I feel, as an American, like biting my lips with shame, at the very thought of giving utterance to it. A Yankee, sir, came into one of these ports; and, be it known to you, sir, a Yankee is hard to beat. An English ship was lying in port at the same time; the Yankee shipped his colored seamen on board the British ship for safe keeping, and there they were safe, Sir, because it would not do to put one of John Bull's seamen in jail; John's bull-dogs would break the jail down, sir, and this they well knew.

Now, sir, what has become of the right of petition? Gone! gone! but I hope not forever. But, sir, what is our flag? have our own citizens to fly for protection to the flag of a foreign nation, and that, too, in our own commerce, and in our own ports? Publish it not in Vienna, let it not be known in St. Petersburgh, that freedom's flag is no longer a protection to the sons of the heroes of '76, even in the ports of their own and their fathers country. Sir, my soul is deeply humbled with this—what shall I call it? Oh! that it had no name. I will give none. I am an American; I love my country; I feel, yes, sir, I feel deeply, for her injured honor. Is there a man here, who has a drop of American blood in his veins, who does not feel, and who will not come, and come at once, to freedom's rescue? Sir, I will never rest, unless it be in my grave, until my country's glory is once more raised on high.

But, sir, this resolution goes still farther; it says that slavery has put a "gag in the mouth of our representatives." This is also true. Witness the cases of Mr. Adams and Mr. Giddings, in the present Congress. Why, sir, our representatives have been insultingly told that if they would go south they would be hung. Are freemen's representatives to be told in freedom's hall, that they would be hung? Can this be endured? But they are not only insulted, but one from your own state, one of whom Ohio may well boast, has been censured—virtually expelled without a trial. I must stop soon, sir, or my American Irish blood will reach boiling heat.

But, sir, the resolution says the slave states have denied the citizens of the free states "the privileges and immunities secured to them by the constitution." This is true—true to the letter. What are those privileges? The citizens of each state shall have the same privileges and immunities as citizens of the several states. *See* ART. 4. SEC. 2. The meaning is, we are citizens, not of states only, but of a common country; and our right of citizenship extends to all parts of that country; giving all the same rights and protection, in the pursuit of our vocations, which are secured to the persons who live in the states where we may be. But do we enjoy these rights? Can we go to slave states with the safety that slaveholders can come here? No, sir; there are now, we are informed, rolls making out to be hung up in public houses of the south, for the purpose of finding out Anti-Slavery men, when they go

* Louisiana has since passed a similar law.

there. These rolls contain the names of prominent abolitionists, that when one of these men may happen to stop at one of these houses, and register his name at the bar, he may be known and lynched. And I am informed that a biped, (I have more respect for my race than to say man,) called Curtiss—(my respect for names makes me regret that he has any name; that the alphabet of my mother tongue should be disgraced in forming a name for such a being,)—has offered his service to help to make out these rolls. This is too bad.—For aught I know, they have my name—doubtless they have Judge King's, hanging in their public places; but if they have, it may hang, for I will never go there to unhang it—no, sir, never.

Now, sir, have not the just expectations of our fathers been frustrated by the aggressions of the slave power? Has not that power nullified and set at nought all the constitutional guaranties of our most sacred rights? Disappointed hope, with feelings which cannot be uttered, but as it can, answers, *yes*, YES. Yes, and unless the aggression be staid, liberty's death groans will answer yes. The sun of freedom will be drowned in blood.

I will give one case which will illustrate this point:—A Mr. Hopkins, of this state, a portrait painter, was induced to go south by a southern gentleman, to practise his art. Mr. H. had some fears that his abolition principles might expose him to danger; but was assured that if he said nothing on the subject, he would be as safe in the south as in Ohio. With these assurances Mr. H. went, and when he went said nothing on the subject. When he had been there some months, the gentlemen, at whose instance he went, whispered to some friend that Mr. H. was an abolitionist, but did not do it to injure him; this friend told it to another, and the thing soon became known among the patriarchs, and the first thing Mr. H. knew, Judge Lynch served a process on him to leave the state in three hours; and it took all the influence of the gentleman who induced him to go there, and the inn-keeper at the river, thirteen miles distant, to keep him from being lynched. And I want it understood, that Mr. H. had not opened his mouth on the subject of slavery; he was driven away for the *liberty of thought*. Now, sir, I inquire, in view of this fact, what is American citizenship worth to a northern man at the south? Why, sir, it is not worth a pinch of snuff; and this, to me, is one of the poorest things in creation.

I will call attention to one more phaze of this subject. The south owes the north, at this time, more than 200 millions of dollars, for imported goods and home manufactured articles. But how are these debts to be collected? Let an agent go to make collections, and it is only necessary to raise the report that he is an abolitionist, and Judge Lynch will have him out of the state in *three* hours, or buried in it in a little longer, or more probably denied the right of sepulture.

Now, sir, having fully established, as I think, the doctrines set forth in the resolution, I will call the attention of the convention to the means by which these things have been brought about.

The free states have a majority of forty-two in the Lower House of Congress, and the same majority of votes for President and Vice President; so that the north or free states can make the President, control the veto power, and the casting vote in the Senate; from which it is plain, that the free states have the power to protect themselves against the aggressions of slavery. But how has it happened, that they have been so misled! Have they no regard to their own interests? Do they only live for slavery? Sir, they have been blinded by slavery? There are not many politicians at the North? Though we have great learning and talents, we have but few politicians. Our great men are burdened with the drudgery of some business or profession, which is such a tax on their time, that they look at politics, as they look at other great subjects in which they are interested; but they do not study this science; they have not time; hence they are to a great degree ignorant of political crafts. Not so with the south. When a southern gentleman completes his education, and studies some profession, for the most part law, he settles at his mansion, and gives his after life to the study of politics. He needs not to look over his slaves; another is hired to do this, and he has nothing to do, but to read political reviews, study the plans of national policy, and the history of government and legislation. The northern statesman has not time, except in a very few instances, to give his attention to the subject, and cannot be expected to have the same amount of knowledge, though the equal or superior of his southern brother in every other respect.

But this is not all. The south, when they get a suitable man in Congress, keep him there for twenty or thirty years, by which means he becomes familiar with the rules of order, and the routine of business. But not so with the north. We go for rotation in office; hence our delegation, for the most part, are green hands, some very green, and are for this reason, also, not prepared to cope with their more experienced southern fellow members.

But the chief cause is in this. We have had for a long time three great political parties; a slavery party, or a party for slavery's interests, a democratic, and a whig party. But one is ready to say, I did not know there were three parties; I thought there were but two. Yes, and in this consists the mistake of the north. We have been divided into two great political parties, and have thought we had Whigs and Democrats in the south, who were with us in heart; but this was and is a great mistake. The south has always been but one party, and that a slavery party. But this party has gone by a cognomen: a part of it has been called Whig, or whatever other name this party may have been called for it has had so

veral since I can recollect, and the other Democratic; but their division only exists in name: when they come to act, they always act together. Witness the reduction of the tariff when Mr. Clay and General Jackson and all the south went one way, and other instances might be given, but I forbear. Not so at the north: here these divisions are real, and the south tries to keep the parties as far apart as possible, fill them with party hate and strife, and when they get us into "full wrangled strife," they come in, and propose to help one side whip the other, if the side they propose to make victorious will do something they want done; but they take care to be served first. This, sir, is their policy, and a successful one it has been, too. Nor do they care which side they unite with, or rather get to unite with them. Thus they keep the northern laborers engaged in party strife, with their thumbs in each other's eyes up to the first joint, by which means they are as blind as bats to their true, their own interest, and become an easy prey to the south.*

We now come to inquire how we, our country, and freedom, shall be rescued from this awful state of things? This inquiry is soon answered: free the general government from the control of the slaveocracy, and the work is done. We want no new organization of government: the government we have is just the thing: the evil is not in the government, but in the usurpation of the slave power. Bring the government to the true principles of the Constitution; we want no more—to the principles of the whiggery of '76, or the democracy of gone by days, and the work is done.

But, Sir, the principles of the present democracy, or union whiggery, which is a union of every thing opposed to the past administration, will not do this. Here, Sir, I would like to give a definition of democracy, which will also answer for the Whiggery of '76. Democracy has but one article in its creed. "The greatest amount of liberty to the greatest number of persons."—This, Sir, is true democracy, and this is anti-slavery. But, Sir, I am not a patent democrat.—No, Sir. This thing is a strange mixture of, I scarcely know what: the federalists of my young days are carded all through the present democrats, or, more properly, loco focos, until they are nothing but brindles; and the whigs are like the Dutch woman's cow, *speckled* from white, and *speckled* from black; yes, Sir, *speckled* from even more colors than these. We cannot depend on these *brindled* and *speckled* parties to save the country. No, Sir. They have brought us where we are.

I am aware that the whigs will try to make us believe that we may expect something from them, and we ought to unite with them to put down the locos; and this would be doing great good. But as an independent liberty party we can do nothing for them. We will lose our votes—throw them away; they are more friendly to us, and all this kind of thing. But, Sir, I want proof.—The 21st Rule was passed last year by a majority of six; then Congress was loco foco. This year, when the whigs have a majority of 41, if I mistake not, the same vote was passed by a majority of 21. This is the evidence they give us of being more friendly. The admitting coarse wool and linen free, thus allowing the south to clothe their slaves free of duty, is the evidence, or some of the evidences they give of being allied to the interests of slavery. I do not mention whigs because I have less confidence in them than in the locos, for I have none in either, not a particle, Sir; but because an effort is made to influence us to look to them for some help; which will only keep back our country's redemption; and it may keep it off too long—of this I have some fear. The policy pursued by the locos is not likely to mislead. They kick us out of their ranks: some here know this. The whigs try to keep us in, to let the slaveholders kick us; this is the mighty difference. We have nothing to hope from either of these parties.

The charge that we intend to break down the Whig party is true; yes, sir, it is true, and more than this is true; we intend to break down the Loco party too; and, by the aid of truth and truth's

* On my way from the convention I heard the following fact, which is but one illustration of this position. The abolitionists in Muskingum Co., Ohio, were in the habit, some time since, of questioning the candidates brought out by the two great parties for office, in view of casting their votes for such as were most favorable to human rights. Gen. Godard and Mr. Chambers were the Whig candidates for the Legislature. The Whigs came to the abolitionists, and begged them not to ask these gentlemen any questions; because, if they did, Gen. G. would come out and answer them in such a way as to defeat his election and the Whig ticket; that he was favorable to Anti-Slavery, as was Mr. Chambers: this their answers would show, and for this they would be defeated; and as the abolitionists knew these things, they had better not ask the question, but vote for them, and they would be elected. They complied with the wishes of their professed friends; and these gentlemen were elected, and went to the Legislature, and voted for the *black law*—the blackest law that ever disgraced the statute book of any civilized nation of our sinful earth; a law which inflicts a fine of from $50 to $500 for giving a starving fellow creature a piece of bread.

But why was this strange thing done? Gov. Morehead, of Kentucky, was one of the delegates sent to procure the passage of this law.—He was a Whig, and informed the Whigs, if a number of them did not vote for this law, the south would believe they were in league with the abolitionists, and if this idea got out, (and it would, if they did not vote for this law,) the Whigs could not elect their presidential candidate in 1840. But they would show, by voting for this nefarious law, that they had no connection with, or sympathy for abolitionism; then the south, at least Kentucky, would go with the Whigs, and their candidates might be elected.—And to secure the interests of the south, from G. and Mr. C. voted for this law. And I have no doubt but either of these gentlemen would break it. Yes, I believe they would have broken it the day after they voted for it. But it had to be done, to get the south to help them to put down their political opponents. This I have from unquestionable authority, and it shows clearly how the south have managed the political parties.

Divine Author, we will do both; and as one must fall before the other, we are not concerned which; our great concern is to break down both as soon as possible, and restore the government to the true principles of the constitution—administer the government for the benefit of freemen, not of despots.

But we are met with, You are too weak to do any thing; you will lose your votes; you are throwing them away; you cannot succeed. But, sir, we are not to be moved by such cries as these. We hear much about losing votes. But, sir, can both of the other parties succeed? Will neither of them lose votes? Are the friends of liberty the only voters who will lose their votes? It would seem so. But, sir, the worst thing that can happen us is to be as well off after the election as one of the other parties; for both cannot beat; and we may be better off than both, for we may beat both. This I admit is not probable this year; but it soon will be, not only probable, but it soon will be done; because we have adopted the motto of the old Roman, "never give up the commonwealth;" and, distracted, torn, and crushed as is our beloved country, we do not despair. The people are honest; they love their country; and when they are brought to see its true interests, they will act for those interests; and they shall see them; yes, sir, *they shall;* and when they see them, they will not be frightened by the crying of abolition; that will then be their watchword.

Let us apply this mode of reasoning to other undertakings. Here is a man going to build a house; but he must lay the foundation; and just as he is ready to lay the first stone, up comes a neighbor, who is building a house hard by, and has it pretty nearly up, and says, you cannot succeed; you are too weak; you will not be able to put the top stone on for a long time to come: and you are unwise to lay one stone in the foundation until you can put on the top stone at the same time. Come and help me. What would the wise builder say? He would reply, I must lay the foundation before I can build, and I must build before I can put on the top stone; and besides all this, slavery is the corner stone of your edifice, and this must not be in any part of the temple of freedom; and I must pull your building down to the very foundation, to get this stone, to throw it away. It would be very foolish to help you to build, seeing I have to pull down your building to the very foundation. Just so with us, sir; if we cannot succeed this fall, we can lay the foundation—yes, we can do more, we can build several rounds.—This will not be lost labor. We tell our Whig and Loco-Foco friends, we can do nothing for you: you have made the interests of the slaveholder the corner stone of the house you are raising, and we intend to pull it down to the very foundation, and throw this stone out of the nation, and out of the world. But as we pull down the pro-slavery parties, we will build up our liberty party with the materials thereof. We have no objection to any thing but the foundation stone; and just as we tear up the corner stone, and cast it into the dead sea, we will bring the top stone of Freedom's temple, singing, Liberty! Liberty! Liberty!!! Liberty!!! unto it. The chorus of this delightful song shall be, *Babylon, who traded in slaves and souls of men, is fallen, is fallen! Babylon is fallen!* May the God of all the earth hasten the day, and let all the people say Amen.